

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MICHIEL GLEN OAKES,

Petitioner,

Case No. C20-996-JCC-MLP

V.

## ORDER

DONALD R. HOLBROOK,

## Respondent.

This is a federal habeas action brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter is before the Court on Petitioner Michiel Glen Oakes’ “Surreply Re: Striking Argument in Respondent’s Reply” (“Petitioner’s Motion”). (Dkt. # 33.)

On December 1, 2021, Respondent submitted a response to Petitioner’s motion for an evidentiary hearing, and a reply to Respondent’s Answer, in a single combined filing (“Respondent’s Reply”). (Dkt. # 31.) Petitioner’s Motion requests that the Court strike material contained in Respondent’s Reply, alleging that a portion of Respondent’s argument concerning Petitioner’s failure to file his habeas petition by the federal statute of limitations was not initially addressed in Respondent’s Answer. (Dkt. # 33 at 1-2 (citing dkt. # 31 at 2-3).) In the alternative,

1 Petitioner requests that the Court re-note his habeas petition to January 3, 2022, to allow him an  
 2 opportunity to respond to the alleged new argument. (*Id.* at 2.)

3 Pursuant to Local Rule 7(g), a party may request to strike material contained in a reply  
 4 brief. In such instances, the opposing party may file a surreply requesting that the court strike the  
 5 material, subject to the following requirements:

- 6 (1) That party must file a notice of intent to file a surreply as soon after  
     receiving the reply brief as practicable;
- 7 (2) The surreply must be filed within five days of the filing of the reply brief,  
     and shall be strictly limited to addressing the request to strike. Extraneous  
     argument or a surreply filed for any other reason will not be considered;
- 9 (3) The surreply shall not exceed three pages . . . .

10 LCR 7(g).

11 Here, Petitioner filed his notice of intent to file a surreply within a day of receiving  
 12 Respondent's Reply, and Petitioner's Motion was filed within five days of the filing of  
 13 Respondent's Reply and does not exceed three pages. *See* LCR 7(g). However, the Court fails to  
 14 discern what new argument was improperly brought forth by Respondent's Reply. Based on the  
 15 Court's review of Respondent's Answer and Reply, the argument contained in Respondent's  
 16 Reply regarding Petitioner's alleged failure to file his habeas petition by the federal statute of  
 17 limitations—and the time either included or excluded for tolling the statute of limitations  
 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2)—merely further develops Respondent's initial argument on  
 19 this issue contained in his Answer. *Compare* dkt. # 14 at 7-9 *with* dkt. # 31 at 2-3. Contrary to  
 20 Petitioner's assertion, Respondent's argument does not raise a new issue for the first time on  
 21 reply. *Cf. State of Nev. v. Watkins*, 914 F.2d 1545, 1560 (9th Cir. 1990).

22 Nevertheless, the Court, having reviewed the briefing of the parties and the balance of the  
 23 record, concludes that a surreply from Petitioner addressing the time either included or excluded

1 for the tolling of the federal statute of limitations to file a habeas petition would aid the Court in  
2 its resolution of Petitioner's federal habeas claims.

3 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:

4 (1) The Court DENIES Petitioner's Motion (dkt. # 33).

5 (2) Petitioner is directed to file his Surreply to Respondent's Reply on or before

6 **January 3, 2022.** This will conclude the briefing in this matter.

7 (3) Respondent's Answer (dkt. # 14) and Petitioner's Motion for Evidentiary Hearing  
8 (dkt. # 29) are RE-NOTED on the Court's calendar for consideration on **January 3, 2022.**

9 (4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the parties and to the  
10 Honorable John C. Coughenour.

11  
12 Dated this 6th day of December, 2021.

13   
14

15 MICHELLE L. PETERSON  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23